

# CLINTON TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION

*REPORT OF MEETING*

*FEBRUARY 28<sup>TH</sup>, 2019*

**PRESENT:** Kirkanne Moseley, Chairperson  
Ronald DiBartolomeo, Vice-Chairperson  
Katherine Cherry, Secretary  
Joe A. Aragona  
Stephen Charron  
Lawrence Opalewski, Jr.  
Daniel Spatafora  
Denise C. Trombley

**ABSENT:** George Brumbaugh (Excused)

**STAFF:** Bruce Thompson, AICP, Director  
DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND  
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Ms. Moseley called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

## **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

Motion by Mr. Opalewski, supported by Mr. Aragona, to approve the agenda with the deletion of Item #4 – Proposed Rezoning of 7.72 acres of land on Romeo Plank Road, and Item #5 – Site Development Plan for Italian American Club House/Cultural Center Addition. Discussion ensued.

Mr. Opalewski stated he will defer to Mr. Thompson for the reason as to why Items #4 and #5 are being deleted from tonight's agenda.

Mr. Thompson explained to the Commission and anyone who may be present for Items #4 and #5, which is the rezoning and Site Development Plan for the Italian-American Cultural Center Addition, that the notices that went to the newspaper and to the owners and/or occupants of property located within 300 feet of the property in question had the wrong information on them. He apologized that, unfortunately, the cases cannot be heard because they were not properly posted legally. He stated that if there are any citizens present for this case, he apologized once again, indicating there was not sufficient time to send out a notice of cancellation because he was just recently made aware of the situation. He suggested that anyone wanting more information can remain until after the meeting, and he will share the plan with them. He suggested those interested

can also contact the Planning Department at their convenience, and he assured he would be happy to meet with any of the citizens who may be here tonight and wanted to hear about the case. He reiterated his apology to the petitioner, Commission and citizens, noting it was an oversight on his part. He explained they will be placing this back on a Planning Commission agenda at the request of the petitioner, and the next readily-available meeting will be Thursday, March 28<sup>th</sup>, 2019 at 6:30 p.m. He assured that proper notices will go out to the newspaper for publication and to owners and/or occupants of property located within 300 feet of the land in question.

Roll Call Vote: Ayes – Opalewski, Aragona, Charron, Cherry, DiBartolomeo, Moseley, Spatafora, Trombley. Nays – None. Absent – Brumbaugh. Motion carried.

**2.27 ACRES OF VACANT LAND FRONTING THE SOUTH LINE OF HALL ROAD (M-59), EAST OF MADDELEIN, ADDRESSED AS 22480 HALL ROAD (SECTION 2) (PARCEL #16-11-02-129-012)**

- **SITE DEVELOPMENT PLAN: HALL ROAD EAST SELF-STORAGE (AKA 1-800-SELF-STORAGE.COM)**
  - **REQUEST FOR RECOMMENDATION FOR APPROVAL**  
**FILE #19-6871: PETITIONED BY MR. EUGENE SHERIZEN**  
**REPRESENTED BY MR. PETER STUHLREYER, DESIGNHAUS**
- 

Ms. Cherry informed that notice of this item on tonight's agenda was mailed to 33 owners and/or occupants of property located within 300 feet of the land in question, with none of those returned as undeliverable.

Mr. Thompson reviewed his letter to the Commission dated February 14<sup>th</sup>, 2019 and explained that the petitioner for this case is proposing development of a mini-storage warehouse facility on a parcel slightly over 2-1/4 acres of property, located on the south side of Hall Road, east of Maddelein. The site plan proposes 4 one-story buildings, comprising a total of 28,000 square feet, with a total of 58 one-story units, along with an office. The buildings will be at a height of 14 feet one inch, and all perimeter elevations will be brick, with the remaining construction being block and metal on the interior of the site. The site will be accessed from one driveway on Hall Road, will contain the minimum required number of parking spaces for the use, which is three. Screening landscaping includes berm and landscaping along the Hall Road side of the site, and a six-foot high masonry wall and plantings along the west side of the site, adjacent to the existing residential homes. There will be a six-foot-high black-coated chain link fence around the remainder of the site for security. The site plan includes storm water management information, which provides for a detention pond along the west side of the site. A tree survey has been submitted, and 71 trees, as well as additional landscaping in the form of shrubbery, will be replaced back on this site. Site lighting and signage are provided in accordance with ordinance

requirements. He concluded this plan meets or exceeds all ordinance requirements, and therefore, approval is recommended.

Mr. Joe Latozas, of Designhaus Architecture, 301 Walnut Boulevard, Rochester, Michigan 48307, thanked Mr. Thompson for doing a great job explaining the proposed project. He confirmed it is a 28,000-square-foot self-storage facility, comprised of four buildings (58 units). There will be two double-loaded drive-up buildings measuring 12-feet 8-inches in height, and two single-loaded buildings measuring 15-feet 11-inches tall. There will be a masonry wall facing the residential zoning. They are proposing to use a “c-brick” product, which is the dark gray material at the bottom of the material board. He indicated the same material will be used for the six-foot-high wall directly adjacent to the residential zone. He advised they intend to plant a “green wall” of evergreen trees behind the masonry wall, so that will provide a solid green screen over the years that the residents will see over the wall. He noted they are excited to bring this product to the community, and they feel it fills a need in the area. He offered to answer questions or address comments.

Ms. Moseley stated this is not a public hearing, but she added they will allow the public to make comments.

Mr. Steve Popke, 44740 Maddelein, Clinton Township, Michigan 48036, stated he was concerned with the lighting on the self-storage units. He questioned the type of lighting proposed and what type of easement will be provided for the electrical wires and poles behind the residential houses. He stated his questions regarding the masonry wall were answered, but he would like to see the material board that he showed the Commission. He questioned whether this is a 24-hour operation, and whether there will be storage of vehicles at this facility. He would like more information regarding a retention pond and where that will be located in relation to the abutting residential homes.

Ms. Lydia Shanks, 44832 Maddelein, Clinton Township, Michigan 48036, thought she heard the petitioner refer to a 15-foot masonry wall and inquired as to clarification on the height of the wall.

Mr. Thompson replied the wall will be six feet in height.

Ms. Shanks questioned whether there will be barbed wire on top of the wall to keep people from jumping over the wall. She was concerned about how the lighting on this site will affect the neighboring back yards. She questioned the impact of this development on the neighboring property values, and whether this is a “done deal”.

Ms. Moseley assured it is not a “done deal” and that is why there are here tonight discussing it.

Ms. Shanks reiterated her question as to what this will do to the value of the abutting properties. She is pleased to see a solid wall proposed along their rear property line, but she questioned why they would allow chain link fence around the rest of the property.

Ms. Trista Hopkins, 44724 Maddelein, Clinton Township, Michigan 48036, questioned whether this will be an indoor or outdoor storage facility. She questioned whether this will impact the taxes and value of the neighboring properties. She further questioned whether the construction of this building, as well as the adjacent parking, disrupt the foundations of the existing homes in the area. She questioned as to whether they would consider an 8-foot-tall wall rather than 6-feet, depending upon the lighting situation. She claimed there are 14 storage facilities in the area already and questioned why another one is needed. She questioned the hours of operation for this proposed facility, and what is going to happen between the properties. She expressed concern about rat and mice harborage.

Mr. Latozas thanked the residents for their questions and proceeded to answer as many questions as possible. He explained the site was designed in such a way as to push all of the storage units away from the abutting residential area. There will be a 6-foot-high masonry wall on their property which abuts the residential homes. Behind that wall they will have a series of trees that will create a “green wall”, and behind that is a detention basin to store excess storm water. The units will be on the other side of that detention basin. He calculated that there is 50 feet from the property edge to the building, and all of the lighting is beyond that 50-foot distance. He assured it will all be shielded towards the ground, and none will be pointed toward the abutting residential property. For the lighting on the building that faces the residential property, there will be another building, trees and a masonry wall that will block that view. He assured there will be no “light pollution” on the site. They purposely selected lights that do not create an issue. They have covers on the top that forces all of the light to reflect downwards. He confirmed that the electrical easement will remain the same as it is now, and he anticipated their hours of operation will be from 8 a.m. to 9 p.m., stressing it is not a 24-hour operation. There is no vehicular storage. He showed the residents the site development plan and where the detention basin is proposed to be located in relation to their houses. He assured there will be no barbed wire on top of the masonry wall, but there will be a limestone cap. He confirmed that they will have a chain link fence along the outside of the site.

Mr. Charron questioned whether the buildings on the residential side will have any entry from the retention pond side.

Mr. Latozas replied that is correct, noting the only entrances to the building are from the driveway that faces away from the residents. He confirmed that no resident will ever see anyone entering that building, and they will not see the

open doors. There is no access to the retention pond area. It is for maintenance only and will be locked 24 hours a day.

Mr. Charron inquired as to the type of lighting that is proposed on the building facing the retention pond area.

Mr. Latozas replied they are not proposing any lighting on that side of the building. He replied to further inquiry that they are only proposing lighting in the drive lanes.

Mr. Charron inquired as to how many lights are being proposed.

Mr. DiBartolomeo replied that, according to the plan, it appears ten will be on each side of the building along the drive lanes.

Mr. Latozas indicated they provided a photometric study as part of their site plan submittal, and it shows there will be no light pollution.

Mr. Charron questioned if has a storage facility on this site and he has an emergency arise after hours where he needs to access his storage unit, he questioned whether that is permitted, and if so, how he would get in.

Mr. Eugene Sherizen, of 1-800-Self-Storage, 26640 Harding, Oak Park, Michigan, replied that if it were an emergency situation, they could try to reach one of the managers.

Mr. Charron provided a hypothetical situation where he is a contractor who works nights, and he needs to get in at night to pick up more wire or other supply.

Mr. Sherizen indicated he would have to try to contact the site manager.

Mr. Spatafora questioned whether the lighting will remain on throughout the night after the facility has closed.

Mr. Latozas replied the lights will be on for business hours only, although he admitted it will be dimly-lit for security purposes from dusk to dawn.

Ms. Cherry questioned whether the petitioner or his representative can speak to demand for storage facilities in this area.

Mr. Sherizen replied that he hopes there is a demand. They are willing to invest in the Township with the hope that the demand is there. He explained what separates this facility from those of their competitors is that the units are 100% climate-controlled, so each unit will have heating and air conditioning. He pointed out the majority of their competitors do not offer that amenity for this type of storage unit.

Mr. Aragona requested the petitioner show the residents the artist's rendering of the proposed masonry wall.

Mr. Spatafora questioned whether the petitioner has other facilities in the area similar to what is being proposed.

Mr. Sherizen replied they have another facility in Oak Park, near 11 Mile and Greenfield, but it is older, so this will be nicer, plus it is climate-controlled.

Mr. Popke commented that, after looking at the site development plan, he noticed that the trees are going to be planted along the inside of the wall. He expressed disappointment, thinking they were going to be along the outside of the wall, so the residents would have the view of the wall blocked by the row of trees. He felt if they have to look at the wall, it is going to give them the view of a commercial building.

Ms. Hopkins agreed with Mr. Popke, commenting that they currently have an amazing view. She added that there is a lot of wildlife on the vacant property, including deer and groundhogs, and expressed concern that those animals will find their way into the neighboring yards.

Mr. Latozas assured they take every precaution to assure there is no rodent problem within their facility. He reminded they will have brand new, climate-controlled, sealed-tight buildings, and the nature of how Mr. Sherizen runs his operation, he is confident they will do every single possible thing they can do to make sure there is not a problem.

Mr. Thompson assured that part of the site development plan package included photometrics, which are required. He noted the resident was correct that the lighting has to be shielded down and away from any adjacent residential property, and the photometrics as part of that plan show zero foot-candles at that property line. He explained that the ordinance, from a screening standpoint, allows one of two things, either a 25-foot-wide buffer with trees or a masonry wall. He stated those are the two options the ordinance allows for the petitioner to provide screening between commercial/industrial sites and residential sites. He noted they chose to provide both, with the installation of a wall and the planting of trees, which will then grow above the wall to provide additional screening above the 6-foot height of the wall. He stated this goes above-and-beyond minimum landscaping requirements. Mr. Thompson explained the purpose and requirements of a detention pond, noting on any new or redeveloped site, there are storm water requirements. This development is required to detain all of its storm water on the site, and they have limited access to the storm drain. It is designed so any storm water on the site does not shed toward any adjacent property. It will go into the pond area and is released into the system. He pointed out that will happen no matter what would be developed

on this property, although in this case it is a pond, whereas some do it by a pipe in the ground or a combination. He cited the example here at the Civic Center, where there are bioswales, or mini detention ponds, in the parking lot.

Mr. Thompson addressed the concern regarding rats and mice, informing that the buildings will all be on foundations, and the building code requires those to be “rat-proof”. There will not be any ability for rodent harborage and taking into consideration there will be no outdoor storage, it should relieve any issue from that standpoint. He noted the subject of soil erosion was mentioned, but through the development process, the developer will have to obtain a soil erosion permit if this is approved, and that will be through the Township Engineer. They will be required to submit a formal Soil Erosion plan before any construction can begin. He assured there will be no barbed wire. Mr. Thompson stated that, with regard to a mini-storage use, this property is zoned light industrial and mini-storage is a permitted use by right, and the Township Board or this Commission does not have the right to say they do not want this use there. He clarified this Commission’s duty is to make sure the plans presented meet all of the ordinance requirements. He reiterated it is not an issue of use that is being contemplated, and although at times he does not disagree that there are a lot of storage facilities in the area, as a planner, he is gaining an understanding of this community, and he pointed out there are a large number of apartments and condominiums in the Township, which are a very large part of the users of mini-storage facilities. Because this is not a special land use or a rezoning, the Township does not have the ability to say they do not want this use. He addressed the resident who had concern about the lighting, noting that if this is approved, the Planning Department will have to inspect the site so if there is an issue with lighting, he urged residents to contact his office, and he can work together with the developers to make sure there is no impact. He acknowledged that the petitioner and his representative did a good job answering questions and addressing concerns of the residents, and he provided some answers from the Planning Department’s standpoint.

Ms. Moseley questioned whether there are plans available in the Planning Department if any of the residents want to view them.

Mr. Thompson replied affirmatively.

Motion by Mr. Spatafora, supported by Mr. Opalewski, with reference to File #19-6871 and application from Mr. Eugene Sherizen, Hall Road East, LLC, 26640 Harding Street, Oak Park, Michigan 48237, as represented by Mr. Peter Stuhlreyer, Designhaus, 301 Walnut, Rochester, Michigan 48307, concerning the proposed Site Development Plan for Hall Road East Self-Storage (aka 1-800-Self-Storage.com), to be located on 2.27 acres of land fronting the south side of Hall Road, east of Maddelein, addressed as 22480 Hall Road (Section 2) (Parcel #16-11-02-129-012), that recommendation be forwarded to the Clinton Township

Board for approval of the Site Development Plan as submitted. Discussion ensued.

Ms. Anne Ritter, 22363 Pohlman, Clinton Township, Michigan 48036, inquired as to whether there will be electrical service available inside each of the units. She expressed concern about someone being able to live in the units.

Mr. Latozas replied there will be no electrical outlets in the units.

Ms. Ritter inquired as to what type of products can be stored in these units, and whether they are permitted to store hazardous waste. She also inquired whether there will be security cameras on site, and if so, whether any of those will be aimed at the abutting residential properties.

Mr. Latozas replied they are not allowed to store hazardous waste. He replied to further inquiry that they will have security cameras on site but they will not be aimed toward the abutting residential properties.

Mr. Popke questioned the Commission as to whether they will consider requiring something on the outside of the wall to block the view of the wall from the abutting residents so that it does not look like they are looking at a commercial property.

Mr. Thompson cautioned that is a “slippery slope”, because the Township cannot require that a petitioner put landscaping on someone else’s property to screen. He confirmed there is no mechanism to allow that. If it is something the petitioner and adjacent property owners want to work out, that is fine, but he pointed out the wall is there for screening purposes as well as security purposes. A 6-foot wall is not scalable like a chain-link fence. The landscaping on the west side of the wall is designed as a secondary screening to go above the 6-foot wall but is not anything required. Having landscaping for a commercial site on an adjacent residential property would still require the petitioner to maintain that landscaping. The Township does not have the authority to allow them to plant something on someone else’s property, and then direct them to go onto someone else’s property to maintain that landscaping and that involves trespassing.

Roll Call Vote: Ayes – Spatafora, Opalewski, Aragona, Charron, Cherry, DiBartolomeo, Moseley, Trombley. Nays – None. Absent – Brumbaugh. Motion carried.

Ms. Moseley explained the Planning Commission is a recommending body, and this item will be placed on the Township Board agenda of March 25<sup>th</sup>, 2019.

**3.0 ACRES OF VACANT LAND FRONTING THE EAST LINE OF GARFIELD ROAD, NORTH OF CANAL ROAD (SECTION 8) (PARCEL #16-11-08-151-005)**

**- REVISED SITE DEVELOPMENT PLAN: AHI GARFIELD SENIOR (SENIOR LIVING FACILITY)**

**-- REQUEST FOR APPROVAL**

**FILE #19-6707: PETITIONED BY MR. ROBERT ASMAR,  
GARFIELD VENTURE, LLC**

**REPRESENTED BY MR. ANDY ANDRE, P.E.,  
STELLAR DEVELOPMENT LLC**

---

Ms. Cherry confirmed that notification of this item on tonight's agenda was mailed to 89 owners and/or occupants of property located within 300 feet of the land in question, with none of those returned as undeliverable.

Mr. Thompson summarized his Planner Review dated February 13<sup>th</sup>, 2019, and explained that on August 24<sup>th</sup>, 2017, the Planning Commission reviewed a request on this site for a four-story senior living facility, which was subsequently approved by the Township Board on September 12<sup>th</sup>, 2017. He advised that the petitioner contacted the Department of Planning and Community Development and submitted a revised request that include a fifth floor to the building. He noted the proposed five-story building will contain 113 units. It will be provided with off-street parking in excess of ordinance requirements, and he advised that everything else stays the same with regard to landscaping, screening, storm water retention, etc. He concluded that the plan in front of the Commission this evening meets or exceeds ordinance requirements, and therefore, approval is recommended.

Mr. Andy Andre, of Stellar Development, 2600 Auburn Road, Suite 160, Auburn Hills, Michigan 48326, engineer working on the project on behalf of the applicant, explained this revision is the addition of a fifth floor. He explained the reason is when they went through the financing, the study they had done that supports the project came back showing there is a need within the market area for more of these units. The study showed a continued deficiency in this type of housing for senior living. They approached the Planning Department to look at this. He compared it to what was previously approved, noting they also worked with Mr. Thompson to enhance the building, changing it from a pitched roof to a flat roof, and went to approximately 90% durable materials comprised of block and brick. He offered to answer any questions.

Mr. Opalewski questioned what the ordinance permits for a maximum elevation for this type of building in this district. He questioned whether they could construct a ten-story building if they wanted to do so.

Mr. Thompson replied the ordinance allows in excess of five stories, although he added he would have to look up the exact number in the ordinance.

Mr. Andre believed that in this zoning district, they can go as high as seven stories, or 80 feet. He indicated when the height is increased, they have to increase the setback from the property lines accordingly. He assured they are well within the guidelines of the ordinance.

Mr. Opalewski recalled when this came before the Planning Commission in 2017, there were a lot of concerns expressed about the height from the surrounding residents. He assured he is not saying he is not in favor of the plan, but he recalled it being an issue at that time.

Mr. Thompson noted they looked at the structure and design of the building, but the redesign of the building will not have the same impact because the visual height will not be drastically different due to changing the roof from a pitched roof to a flat roof. He added they are also improving the construction materials by going with a brick design, and the administration felt that is a good compromise.

Mr. Spatafora questioned whether the brick and block colors depicted on the artist's rendering of the revised site plan be similar to the actual building when it is completed.

Mr. Andre replied he believes it will be very similar, noting there will be a little contrast in the materials. He clarified it is earth tone with a slight difference between the brick and block colors. He confirmed it will be a brown tone.

Mr. Charron inquired as to the height of the original building that was approved in 2017.

Mr. Andre replied he does not know that by memory, but he indicated going from a pitch roof to a flat roof is not drastic. He assured they are within the requirements. He was surprised with how high they could go with the building, although he admitted that, to make a drastic increase in the height, they would need a much larger piece of property to accommodate the required increased setbacks.

Mr. Charron recalled it was contentious at the time this came before the Planning Commission in 2017.

Mr. Andre reiterated they are within the ordinance requirements.

Motion by Mr. Spatafora, supported by Mr. Aragona, with reference to File #19-6707 and application from Mr. Robert Asmar, Garfield Venture LLC, 32825 Northwestern Highway, Farmington Hills, Michigan 48334, as represented by Mr. Andy Andre, P.E., Stellar Development LLC, 2600 Auburn Road, Suite 160, Auburn Hills, Michigan 48326, concerning the proposed Revised Site Development Plan for AHI Garfield Senior (Senior Living Facility), to be located on 3.0 acres of vacant land fronting the east line of Garfield, north of Canal

(Section 8) (Parcel #16-11-02-129-012), that the Revised Site Development Plan be approved as submitted, with the addition of a fifth story building. Discussion ensued.

Mr. DiBartolomeo noted this was previously approved for four stories, and residents had expressed their concern about that height. He noted they are now asking for another floor and questioned whether the Planning Commission can cap the elevations of the building to limit it to five stories so that the petitioner cannot continue to come back and request additional floors.

Mr. Thompson explained the Planning Commission is basically capping it if they approve this site development plan. He stated the petitioner has the right to come back like anyone else and request a higher building, but it will be the Planning Commission's prerogative as to whether or not to approve it. He pointed out the height of a building in this district is indicated as "unlimited" in the Township ordinance. He commented that the Planning Commission, in their recommendation, can indicate they would like to see it no higher than five stories, but capping it at five stories is not within the jurisdiction of the Planning Commission.

Ms. Trombley pointed out that, even if the petitioner comes forward in the future with plans for another story, they would have to be able to meet parking and setback requirements, which will both increase with the addition of another floor, and they only have a couple acres to work with.

Mr. Spatafora stated that, based on the comments from the petitioner as far as the site dimensions of this three-acre parcel, he has no problems and he would have no problem adding the condition to cap the building at five stories.

Mr. Andre stated he is glad Mr. Thompson brought that up, and he informed that the Michigan Building Code will cap them at seven stories. He commented that, in working with a three-acre parcel, they have to look at the building they have and the other constraints, as far as requirements for parking, storm management, and landscaping. He stressed at three acres, they are comfortable adding a fifth floor to this building because they meet all of the requirements. At a certain point, however, they would reach the point of overflow if they tried to go to six or seven stories and that becomes unattainable. He assured they are good with five stories and meet the requirements of the ordinance. He does not see it going to a different level, and they are very comfortable with the plan they have brought forward.

Roll Call Vote: Ayes – Spatafora, Aragona, Charron, Cherry, DiBartolomeo, Moseley, Opalewski, Trombley. Nays – None. Absent – Brumbaugh. Motion carried.

Ms. Moseley explained that the Planning Commission is a recommending body and this will be forwarded to the Township Board for their final consideration on March 25<sup>th</sup>, 2019.

**7.72 ACRES OF LAND FRONTING THE WEST LINE OF ROMEO PLANK ROAD, NORTH OF PARTRIDGE CREEK BOULEVARD, ADDRESSED AS 43843 ROMEO PLANK (SECTION 5) (PARCEL #16-11-05-426-002)**

- **PROPOSED REZONING: RML MULTIPLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL AND R-1 ONE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL TO B-3 GENERAL BUSINESS**

-- **PUBLIC HEARING**

**FILE #19-6877: PETITIONED BY MR. GIOVANNI MANIACI,  
ITALIAN-AMERICAN CULTURAL CENTER**

**REPRESENTED BY MR. SIMON MAURO, MAURO ENGINEERING**

---

This item was deleted from tonight's agenda.

**7.72 ACRES OF LAND FRONTING THE WEST LINE OF ROMEO PLANK ROAD, NORTH OF PARTRIDGE CREEK BOULEVARD, ADDRESSED AS 43843 ROMEO PLANK (SECTION 5) (PARCEL #16-11-05-426-002)**

- **SITE DEVELOPMENT PLAN: ITALIAN-AMERICAN CLUB HOUSE / CULTURAL CENTER ADDITION**

-- **REQUEST FOR RECOMMENDATION FOR APPROVAL**

**FILE #19-6056: PETITIONED BY MR. GIOVANNI MANIACI,  
ITALIAN-AMERICAN CULTURAL CENTER**

**REPRESENTED BY MR. SIMON MAURO, MAURO ENGINEERING**

---

This item was deleted from tonight's agenda.

**1.22 ACRES OF LAND FRONTING THE WEST LINE OF GRATIOT AVENUE, NORTH OF 15 MILE ROAD, ADDRESSED AS 35275 GRATIOT AVENUE (SECTION 27)**

- **SITE DEVELOPMENT PLAN: FIFTH THIRD BANK**

-- **REQUEST FOR RECOMMENDATION FOR APPROVAL**

**FILE #19-6276: PETITIONED BY FIFTH THIRD BANK**

**REPRESENTED BY MS. JILL BRYAN, BDG ARCHITECTS**

---

Ms. Cherry confirmed that notification of this item on tonight's agenda was mailed to 44 owners and/or occupants of property located within 300 feet of the land in question, with 13 of those returned as undeliverable.

Mr. Thompson explained that this is another site that was previously before the Planning Commission and was approved by the Township Board for the same use on this same site on January 28<sup>th</sup>, 2010, and at that time, there were multiple

variances granted by the Board of Appeals. The Site Plan valid period expired, but they are now back with a request for Site Development Approval. He explained the one-story 3,000-square-foot brick building has a height of 17 feet 4 inches, and 21 off-street parking spaces are being provided, which is in excess of the minimum required. He added that stacking spaces are provided for the drive-thru lanes according to ordinance standards, and landscaping is provided according to ordinance standards. He noted that storm water drainage is included as required, and site lighting and signage are also included on the plans and meets or exceeds ordinance requirements. Mr. Thompson stated the plan has the need for one variance, although when it was originally approved, there were a number of variances granted. Mr. Thompson explained he was pleased that the petitioners came in to meet with him, and in rereviewing the plan, they were able to eliminate all but one of the variances. He stated they are asking that the Planning Commission forward this to the Township Board with recommendation for approval contingent upon the variance being granted by the Zoning Board of Appeals, which is for a minimum 25-foot parking setback that is typical of the B-3 District. He added that typically, a buffer and a berm and landscaping are done, but if a variance is granted, a buffer screen wall is put up in place of the trees, and that is included on the plan. He pointed out they need a 12-foot greenbelt variance, and they are scheduled for the next Zoning Board of Appeals meeting.

Mr. Jack Marshall, with BDG Architects, 2100 First Avenue North, Suite 100, Birmingham, Alabama 35203, stated Mr. Thompson provided a great description of the proposed development, and they are excited to start on the project.

Mr. Spatafora questioned whether there are any main differences in the building structure from the previously approved plan in 2010 until now.

Mr. Marshall replied that the building is slightly smaller, which allowed them to avoid some of the other variances that were previously granted. They are proposing 3,000 square feet, whereas the previously-planned building was 4,000 square feet. He stated he was not involved with the original plan. He added the building is more contemporary in design, and the driveway has been reduced slightly. He also explained that stacking for a bank is not what it used to be because the banking industry has changed, noting there is less demand for being on site. He added not as many people are in line cashing checks but people come in for financial advice, so the facilities do not have to be as large.

Mr. Spatafora questioned if the ingress/egress to the site is off of Gratiot.

Mr. Marshall replied the ingress/egress is off of the parking lot and not off of Gratiot.

Mr. Aragona questioned whether the petitioner has a time frame as to when this will be built.

Mr. Marshall replied he does not have that information now.

Mr. Thompson assured they have tried to get these plans done as quickly as possible. This is a 2019 project and they want to start construction this spring. He noted he has already asked Ms. Bednar and Mr. Miller to allow them to start the review process for engineering and building, once they get to the Zoning Board of Appeals, adding they cannot assume the variance will be granted. They want to “hit the ground running” once the frost is gone.

Mr. Aragona commented this is an area they are looking forward to seeing improved, so he felt it will be a great addition to that area.

Motion by Mr. Cherry, supported by Mr. Aragona, with reference to File #19-6276 and application from Fifth Third Bank, 530 Walnut Street, Cincinnati, Ohio 45202, as represented by Ms. Jill Bryan, BDG Architects, 2100 First Avenue North, Suite 100, Birmingham, Alabama 35203, concerning the proposed Site Development Plan for Fifth Third Bank, to be located on 1.22 acre of land fronting the west line of Gratiot Avenue, north of 15 Mile Road (Section 27) (Parcel #16-11-27-403-010), that recommendation be forwarded to the Clinton Township Board for approval of the Site Development Plan as submitted, contingent upon the petitioner receiving the necessary variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals. Roll Call Vote: Ayes – Cherry, Aragona, Charron, DiBartolomeo, Moseley, Opalewski, Spatafora, Trombley. Nays – None. Absent – Brumbaugh. Motion carried.

Ms. Trombley informed that the Planning Commission is a recommending body, and this will be forwarded to the Township Board for their final consideration on March 25<sup>th</sup>, 2019.

Mr. Marshall thanked the Commission, and also thanked Mr. Thompson for all of his help.

## **REPORTS OF MEETINGS**

### **-- APPROVAL OF FEBRUARY 14<sup>TH</sup>, 2019 REPORT**

---

Motion by Mr. Spatafora, supported by Mr. Opalewski, to approve the minutes of the February 28<sup>th</sup>, 2019 Planning Commission meeting as submitted. Roll Call Vote: Ayes – Spatafora, Opalewski, Aragona, Charron, Cherry, DiBartolomeo, Moseley, Trombley. Nays – None. Absent – Brumbaugh. Motion carried.

**PLANNING COMMISSION SCHEDULE OF MEETINGS**

**-- NEXT MEETING SCHEDULED FOR THURSDAY, MARCH 14<sup>TH</sup>, 2019**

Mr. Thompson stated the next Planning Commission meeting is scheduled for Thursday, March 14<sup>th</sup>, 2019. He indicated they will be considering the following item that is anticipated to be on that agenda:

- A Conditional Rezoning for the Verus Development – Phase II (Residential), to be located at 18 Mile and Garfield Roads. He noted they currently have the commercial part of that development going forward. When they initially came before the Planning Commission, they were looking at constructing apartments on the site. They withdrew that request and met with the abutting condominium owners, and they will be coming back with a plan for one-story condominiums with attached garages. He stated they went to the Zoning Board of Appeals, noting this will be the last one that will go to the Zoning Board first, and they received variances for the plan.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Motion by Mr. Charron, supported by Mr. Spatafora, to adjourn the meeting. Motion carried. Meeting adjourned at 7:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

*Katherine Cherry*

Katherine Cherry, Secretary  
CLINTON TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION

ces:03/04/19

ces:03/05/19

Approved 03/14/19